

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

CARL WILLIAMS AND HASSAN ALEEM et al
Creditors/Objectors,

v

In re:
City OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN
AND EMERGENCY MANAGER
KEVYN D. ORR

Debtors/City of Detroit

Chapter 9
Case No. 13-53846
Judge Steven W Rhodes

Case No. 14-cv-10434
Hon. Bernard A. Freidman
Magistrate Paul J. Komives

**OBJECTION TO THE FILING OF REDLINED VERSION OF EIGHTH
AMENDED PLAN FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF DEBTS OF THE CITY
OF DETROIT FAILURE TO FILE IN GOOD FAITH AND THE COURT
LACKS JURIDICION ON THE OCTOBER 31 2014 PLAN**

We/I OBJECT TO THE REDLINED VERISON OF THE EIGHTH AMENDED
PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE DEBTS OF THE CITY OF DETRIOIT AND
CONFIRMATION OF THE PLAN, THERE WAS NO NOTICE, IT WAS AFTER
THE FACT, UNTIMELY, CONTRARY TO THE FACTS, MISREPRESENTATION
OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE AND RULES AND HAS NOT BEEN PRESENT
ED AND CONDUCTED IN A GOOD FAITH MANNER.

We/I object to the filing of redlined version of the Eighth Amended
Plan of Adjustment for the debts of the city of Detroit and confirmation of any
Plan stemming from or connected to this Plan of Adjustment and show the
following:

FILED
NOV 10 A 11:55
U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
DETROIT

1) We object to the plan of adjustments and any confirmation of the plan because on its face, according to Judge Steven W Rhodes order and opinion and our objections regarding good faith make it irrefutable and uncontested that the bankruptcy failed to file and conduct the proceeding in good faith, which is grounds for a dismissal by itself, neither alone the other violations of bankruptcy codes 11 USC 903, 904, 923, and 921 and Fed.R.Bankr. P. 9007, 9008, thus has failed to meet the requirement of title 11 U.S.C. 903, 904, 923 and Bankruptcy Procedures Rules 9007 and 9008 and has failed to meet the requirement of title 11 U.S.C. 921 (c) and should be dismissed, as required by 11 U.S.C. 921 (c).

2) Kevyn Orr the emergency manager, because he not an elected official, nor was any consent given voluntary or otherwise. See Bankruptcy City of Harrisburg Pennsylvania, 465 B.R. 744 (Bankr. M.D.Pa 2011), In this case the court determined that case should be dismissed because the City Council did not have the authority under the chapter law and third class city code to commence a bankruptcy case on the behalf of the city of Harrisburg and (2) the city of Harrisburg was not specifically authorized under state law to be a debtor under chapter 9 of the Bankruptcy code as required by 11 USC sect 109 (c) (2). In this case the circumstances are the same both officials are not authorized to

file for Bankruptcy and Detroit have no legal state authority to be a debtor therefore, the court lack jurisdiction over the person which is Kevyn Orr and the subject matter being Bankruptcy and violated 11 U.S.C. 109 (c). "Only a municipal may file for relief under chapter 9 for bankruptcy." and Fed. R. Civ. Proc Rule 12 b (1), (2) and (h3) and the case should be dismissed.

Whenever it appears by suggestion of the parties or otherwise that the court lack jurisdiction of the subject matter, the court shall dismiss the action. Fed R. Civ Proc. 12 (h) (3).

3) The bankruptcy was not file and has not proceeded in a good faith manner and contravened the bankruptcy codes 11 USC 903, 904, 923 and Fed.R.Bankr.P. 9007, 9008, thus has failed to meet the requirement of title 11 U.S.C. 903, 904, 923 and Bankruptcy Procedures Rules 9007and 9008 and has failed to meet the requirement of title 11 U.S.C. 921 (c) and should be dismissed, as required by 11 U.S.C. 921 (c).

It is customary and a long standard principle that once an agency or a court has issued rules and regulations to govern its activity, The court's ruled that any time an agency promulgate rules they must scrupulously follow those rules or the decision cannot stand and may not violate them. In this case we are referring to Bankruptcy rules and codes and to bargain in good faith,

regardless who makes the rule they must be followed in a civilized society of rules and law making procedures. Security & Exchange Comm v. Chenery 318 U.S. 80 87, 88 (1943), Service v Dulles, 354 U.S. 363 77 S. Ct 1152, p1 L.ED2nd 1403 (1957) Pacific Molasses Co. v FTC, Tex (356 F2d 386 (1966)).

How can the court legally rule that the City of Detroit is eligible under the Bankruptcy procedures with all of these multiple violations and there are other violations that other objectors has filed. The bankruptcy code state the bankruptcy can only be approve providing you comply with the codes and rules not violate them and the decision cannot stand. See Security & Exchange Comm v. Chenery supra citing Service v Dulles, citing Pacific Molassess supra.

4) The Bankruptcy Court is a non Article III Constitutional court and is without constitutional authority to hear and determine the issue raised in the Eligibility Objections or regular Municipal Bankruptcy hearing. The retirees, pensioners and any person of interest and those who are affected by the Bankruptcy are Constitutionally entitled to have an Article III court determine basic redressable Constitutional issues affecting their livelihood as citizens of the state of Michigan is a due process and equal protection of the law violation of Article 1 section 2 of the State of Michigan Constitution and the 14th

Amendment of the United State Constitution. See Northern Pipe Line
Construction Company V Marathon Pipe Line Company 458 U.S. 50 (1982)
Thomas Wood (American Casebook Series) 2004: ISBN 0 314-14928-7


5) The court in Waldman concluded that parties may not consent to
certain adjudication by Article I bankruptcy judge could also apply to other
non-Article III judges, including federal magistrate judges. Waldman v.
Stone, 698 F.3d 910 (6th Circuit 2012).

In this instance we never was allowed the opportunity to choose or
consent to an Article I bankruptcy judge or Article III judge and was not by the
consent of the municipality of any elected official

I/We hereby certify that the statements made herein are true and correct to the
best of my knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury and contempt of
Court under the laws of the United States of America.



Carl Williams
10112 Somerset
Detroit, Michigan 48224
313 521-5012



Hassan Aleem
2440 Taylor
Detroit, Michigan 48206
313 205-4353

Name	Katrina Henry	name	
Address	510 Trowbridge	Address	
City State & Zip	Det Mich. 41202	City, State & Zip code	

Name		name	
Address		Address	
City State & Zip		City, State & Zip code	

Name		name	
Address		Address	
City State & Zip		City, State & Zip code	

Name		name	
Address		Address	
City State & Zip		City, State & Zip code	

Name		name	
Address		Address	
City State & Zip		City, State & Zip code	

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

CARL WILLIAMS AND HASSAN ALEEM
Creditors/Objectors,

v

In re:
City OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN
AND EMERGENCY MANAGER
KEVYN D. ORR

Debtor/City of Detroit

_____ /

Chapter 9
Case No. 13-53846
Judge Steven W Rhodes

Case No. 14-cv-10434
Hon. Bernard A. Freidman
Magistrate Paul J. Komives

PROOF OF SERVICES

Carl Williams, being first duly sworn deposes and
your name

Say that on November 10th 2014. I sent a copy of Objection to the filing
of redlined version of Eight Amended Plan for the Adjustment of Debts of
the City of Detroit failure to file in good faith and the Court Lacks Juris-
diction on the October 31, 2014 Plan on November 8th 2014, Upon the

concern parties by certified mail at the following address:
City of Detroit
Corporation Council
First National Building
600 Woodward Ave
Detroit, Michigan 48226

FILED
2014 NOV 10 A 11:55
U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
E.D. MICHIGAN - DETROIT

Emergency Manager
Kenyn Orr
Coleman A Young Municipal Center
2 Woodward 11th floor
Detroit, Michigan 48226

I/We hereby certify that the statements made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury and contempt of Court under the laws of the United States of America.

Sign Carl Williams

Dated November 11 2014